

5. List Policy

79

~~SECRET~~

December 17th, 1959

COCOM Document No. 3711.NI 1/3

COORDINATING COMMITTEERECORD OF DISCUSSIONONNEW CHEMICAL AND PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT ITEM NO. 114th December, 1959

Present: Belgium (Luxembourg), France, Germany, Italy, Japan,
Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Documents Nos. 3700.5, 3711.00/1, 3711.NI 1/1 and 2,
New Item No. 1/W.P.1 and 2.

1. At the opening of the third round of discussion, the CHAIRMAN enquired whether the Belgian Delegate was able to state his Government's position.
2. The BELGIAN Delegate stated that he had received no new instructions and would accept the three parts of the United States Delegation's proposal on an ad referendum basis.
3. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate said that in the short time available since the previous discussion on this matter, it had not been possible for him to clarify certain technical points. Subject to satisfactory elucidation of these in bilateral talks, however, he would be able to join a majority to accept parts (a) and (b) of the definition, provided that the cut-off were increased and that the same cut-off were fixed for both parts.
4. The GERMAN Delegate said that he too had found the time at his disposal too short to permit of a thorough examination. The capacity cut-off proposed at the last meeting did not appear to change the situation, however: the coverage would still catch some furnaces used for ordinary steels as well as for refractory metals. If a higher cut-off could be fixed, the German Delegation would be prepared to accept part (a).
5. The FRENCH Delegate said that he would be able to agree to any cut-off acceptable to the German and United Kingdom Delegations.
6. The GERMAN Delegate proposed that the cut-off should be fixed at 5 tons.
7. Following an adjournment for bilateral discussion between the United Kingdom and United States Delegations, the UNITED STATES Delegate said that, if the Committee were unanimous, he would reluctantly accept a cut-off of 5 tons for part (a). As to part (b), however, it was his Delegation's view that the range of sizes of the skull type of vacuum arc furnace was at present too small to permit of a cut-off. Hence, in view of the partial duplication between (a) and (b) which might occur when skull type furnaces employed consumable electrodes, they would advocate the insertion of "n.e.s." at the end of sub-item (a).

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

- 2 -

COCOM Document No. 3711.NI 1/3

The revised proposal would thus read:

"Electric vacuum furnaces as follows:

- (a) Consumable electrode vacuum arc furnaces with a capacity in excess of 5 tons, n.e.s.;
- (b) Skull type vacuum arc furnaces;
- (c) Electron beam vacuum furnaces."

8. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate said that a very thorough study of this matter was being carried out by his authorities owing to the circumstance that the embargo on these furnaces had been lifted only in 1958. The Delegate hoped, nevertheless, that on the basis of a 5-ton cut-off for part (a), it might be possible for his authorities to accept a reimposition of the embargo. Pending receipt of further instructions, he reserved his position.

9. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that on the previous basis of a 3-ton cut-off, part (a) had been accepted by all save the French, German and United Kingdom Delegations. On the German proposal to raise the cut-off to 5 tons, the United Kingdom Delegation reserved their position and the French Delegation would accept in the event of unanimity. On part (b) only the United Kingdom decision was still awaited. Part (c) had been accepted unanimously, although on an ad referendum basis by the Belgian, Italian and United Kingdom Delegations.

10. The COMMITTEE agreed to resume discussion on the 16th December.

~~SECRET~~

EMW